UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,289	01/26/2004	Tetsuya Shirogane	16869N-103900US	2560
	7590 12/22/200 AND TOWNSEND AN	EXAMINER		
TWO EMBAR	CADERO CENTER	MORAN, RANDAL D		
EIGHTH FLOO SAN FRANCIS	SCO, CA 94111-3834		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2435	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/765,289	SHIROGANE, TETSUYA		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	RANDAL D. MORAN	2435	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 December 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original controls.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	t maio a to the plate of filing a bailet	will make a setamad ba	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better the content of the proposed forms.	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ul> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all- non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>23-33</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	I sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u></li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Kimyen Vu/	/R. D. M./		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2435	Examiner, Art Unit 2435		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding Claims 23 and 29, applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. With respect to applicant's argument that the combination fails to teach "wherein a MAC address is obtained from said host computer by adoption of a protocol based on iSCSI text mode negotiation," examiner notes that iSCSI text mode negotiation is clearly taught within Thompson, specifically column 7-lines 45-58. Nelson teaches a means for obtaining a MAC address assigned to the port of the host computer (Nelson- column 9- lines 35-50). Therefore, the combination of Thompson and Nelson discloses obtaining a MAC address based on iSCSI text mode negotiation.

In response to applicant's argument that the combination of Nelson and Thomas would become inoperable, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In response to applicant's argument that the present application describes a solution to the problem of a router interposed between host computers and storage by using the multiple determination means of the claims and the access management table, which stores host MAC address information and associated IP address information which is inconsistent to the intended use of Nelson, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.